

REMARKS

The Examiner's action dated September 25, 2007, has been received, and its contents carefully noted.

As regards the listing of references in the specification, these were clearly cited as part of the description of the prior art and this portion of the specification clearly describes the relevant features of the inventions disclosed in each of the cited reference and clearly identifies the difference between the disclosures of those references and the present invention. Those references were not listed in an IDS because they are believed to be less relevant than the prior art that was cited. It is noted, in this connection, that although those patent publications were also cited in the related international application, they were not cited in the international search report. Since the present specification describes those prior art publications, those descriptions in the specification are available to the Examiner as prior art.

In response to the objection of the specification, the paragraph in question has been amended to include the commas required by the Examiner.

In response to the objection of claim 15, this claim has been amended to depend from claim 14.

In response to the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 112, all of the rejected claims have been amended to provide proper antecedent basis for the terms in question.

The rejection of claims of 1-5, 8, 11 and 14 as anticipated by Cuzel is respectfully traversed for the reason that the applied reference does not disclose the subject matter defined in the application claims, and particularly in parent claim 1, which has been amended in only a minor formal respect.

A particular novel feature of the invention, which is defined in the "characterizing" part of claim 1, is that the part having multiple functions constitutes not only a heat shield and a skirt of the iron, but also constitutes at least in part the steam chamber above the soleplate. Contrary to the assertions presented in support of the rejection, this is not disclosed in the applied reference.

As is acknowledged in the explanation of the rejection, the applied reference does not even illustrate a steam chamber.

With regard to the recitation that the part having multiple functions constitutes at least in part the steam chamber, the Examiner has cited column 1, lines 7-12, 17-22 and 41-45, column 5, lines 3-7 and 14-18 and column 7, lines 17-23 of the U.S patent to Cuzel.

These passages of the reference specification have been carefully reviewed and have been found to not provide any disclosure whatsoever regarding the structure of the steam chamber, or any component that forms a part of the steam chamber and, at the same time, a heat shield and a skirt.

In effect, Cuzel discloses an iron having a steam chamber and discloses, in particular, a part having an orifice, 6, 16 permitting the passage of a needle intended for

supplying the steam chamber of an iron. However, this document does not disclose the characterizing feature of claim 1, according to which the part having multiple functions constitutes at least in part the steam chamber.

The applied reference, in fact, relates to the construction of an iron in which the part having multiple functions is disposed above a heating body, the heating body itself integrating a steam chamber closed by a metal lid independent of the part having multiple functions. A structure of this type is disclosed in, for example, U.S. patent number 5,799,421, which is of record.

It is therefore submitted that claim 1 defines a structure that is not disclosed in the applied reference and which, therefore, cannot properly be considered to be "anticipated" by the disclosure of that reference.

The claims rejected in Section 15 of the action should also be considered allowable, at least in view of their dependency from claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, and in the absence of a clear identification of a more relevant disclosure in the applied reference, it is requested that the rejections presented in the action be reconsidered and withdrawn, that the pending claims be allowed and that this application be found in allowable condition.

Appln. No. 10/547,337  
Amd. dated December 19, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of September 25, 2007

If the above amendment should not now place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to call undersigned counsel to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.  
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By /jmf/  
Jay M. Finkelstein  
Registration No. 21,082

JMF:smb  
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197  
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528  
G:\BN\S\seb\Gelus5\Pto\2007-12-19-amendment.doc